

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
SEAN ANTHONY RIKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

TAYLOR ANNE RIKER,

Defendant.

-----

ORDER

12-cv-641-bbc

Plaintiff Sean Anthony Riker, an inmate at the Wisconsin Secure Program Facility, is proceeding on a claim that defendant Taylor Anne Riker slandered him by falsely telling the police that he had downloaded child pornography on his computer. Both plaintiff and defendant are representing themselves. Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery from defendant, dkt. #46, and specifically asks the court to order defendant to respond to interrogatories and requests for documents submitted by plaintiff. Dkt. #43.

Subsequently, plaintiff filed a letter with the court stating that the parties are engaged in settlement negotiations and asking the court to refrain from issuing any decisions in the case. Dkt. #51. However, I am issuing this decision denying plaintiff's motion to compel because plaintiff should know that his interrogatory and document requests were improper and unacceptable. The majority of plaintiff's discovery requests are inflammatory and irrelevant to the claim in this case. For example, several of plaintiff's interrogatories ask defendant to admit that she has engaged in various criminal activity, including that she

committed burglary, viewed child pornography and abused her children. This information is irrelevant to plaintiff's defamation claim; even if it were not, defendant is not required to admit criminal activity through discovery. Such requests seem intended to intimidate or humiliate defendant rather than obtain information relevant to this case. Plaintiff also requests irrelevant documents from defendant, such as copies of defendant's journal entries, criminal charges filed against defendant, web postings, bank statements and pictures of child pornography. Defendant is not required to respond to any of these because such information is irrelevant to plaintiff's defamation claim. Further, possession and distribution of child pornography is illegal and plaintiff's request for any child pornography is totally inappropriate. Accordingly, I am denying plaintiff's motion to compel. In the event the parties do not settle their disputes, plaintiff should know that any future discovery requests must be tailored specifically to his defamation claim.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Sean Riker's motion to compel, dkt. #46, is DENIED.

Entered this 12th day of August, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge